

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application and entry of the present Amendment are respectfully requested. Claims 2-23 remain in the application. Claims 2-3, 6-7, 9 and 11-17 are currently amended. Claim 1 has been cancelled. Claims 19-23 were previously withdrawn from further consideration. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's allowance of Claim 18 and indication that Claims 14 and 15 include allowable subject matter.

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. More specifically, the Examiner has stated that the phrase "said bearing" in Claim 7, line 3 is without proper antecedent basis. Claim 7 has been amended so as to facilitate prosecution of the application, and is now dependent on claim 4. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 7 is believed to have been overcome and applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Examiner stated that the phrase "said carrier" in Claim 9 is without proper antecedent basis. Claim 9 has been amended so as to facilitate prosecution of the application, and is now dependent on Claim 3. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 9 is believed to have been overcome and applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the matter may be resolved. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for cosmetic or clarificatory reasons. The changes are not provided for overcoming the prior art nor for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The Examiner has stated that the bearing device as claimed in Claim 4 must be shown or the feature cancelled from the claims. Fig. 2 has been amended so as to show the bearing device as claimed in Claim 4. The bearing device is designated by the reference symbol "27". Therefore, the objection to the drawings by the Examiner is believed to have been overcome and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection. Furthermore, the specification has been

amended to include the bearing device, support for the change to the specification can be found in Claims 4 and 5 of the present application. No new matter has been added.

Applicants note that in item 8 on page 4 of the Office action dated November 4, 2004, the Examiner indicated that Claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, in item 5 on page 3 of the same Office action, Claim 14 is listed as being rejected. In a telephone conversation between the Examiner and the Applicants' previous representatives on December 16, 2004, the Examiner indicated that the rejection of Claim 14 is incorrect and item 5 should not include Claim 14, and that Claim 14 is correctly listed as being objected to as per item 8 of the Office action.

It is appreciatively noted from item 8 on page 4 that Claims 14 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Allowable original Claim 14 has been rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim. Therefore, newly-independent Claim 14 is allowable.

Allowable original Claim 15 has been rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim. Therefore, newly-independent Claim 15 is allowable. Dependent Claims 2-13 and 16 depend from independent Claim 15 and are allowable for the same and other reasons.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Smith et al. (US 2,732,701) (hereinafter "Smith"). Claim 17 has been amended so as to include the allowable subject matter of allowable Claim 15. Therefore, Claim 17 is also allowable for the same and other reasons as Claim 15.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, entry of the present Amendment and allowance of Claims 2-17, in addition to previously allowed Claim 18, are respectfully requested. In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out. If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Craig J. Loest", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Craig J. Loest

Registration No. 48,557

February 2, 2005

BSH Home Appliances Corp.
100 Bosch Blvd
New Bern, NC 28562
252-672-7930
email: craig.loest@bshg.com

APPENDIX A

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Applicants have enclosed amended drawings in Appendix A including a copy of original Fig. 1 (unchanged) and a formal "Replacement Sheet" for Fig. 2 including changes made to Fig. 2. The "Replacement Sheet" for Fig. 2 includes a minor amendment changing reference number "5" to "27". In Fig. 2, reference number "27" was added to designate the bearing device. An "Annotated Sheet Showing Changes" for Fig. 2 illustrating the drawing change made to Fig. 2 marked in red is also enclosed in Appendix A. Applicants respectfully request approval of the drawing changes of Fig. 2 and entry of the "Replacement sheet" for Fig. 1.

Enclosures in Appendix A:

Copy of original Fig. 1

"Replacement Sheet" for Fig. 2

"Annotated Sheet Showing Changes" for Fig. 2

2/2

FIG. 2

